

I Will Give You Rest.

Come, O my soul, with many burdens weary,
 Pressed down with woes and sorrows borne alone;
 Toil-worn with travel, in a desert dreary,
 Come, bring thy burdens to thy Saviour's throne.
 Cast all thy care, thy trouble, and thy sorrow,
 Upon the arm of Christ, the Great and Strong;
 Fear naught to-day—trust Jesus for to-morrow;
 Lean on his arm through all thy journey long.
 He shall sustain thee—yes, for thee he careth,
 O wearied one! on this sweet word repose;
 Cast upon Him each care thy spirit beareth,
 He shall support thee till thy journey close.
 He that believeth, into rest doth enter,
 Though still he bear the burden or the rod;
 And then for him who thus on Christ doth venture,
 A rest remains, with all the saints of God.

—THE CHRISTIAN.

Inquiry.

EDITOR EVANGELIST—My Dear Sir:

A cursory reading of Harvey P. Moyer's remarkable diatribe, called out by your strictures upon Pedro Baptist renderings of the Greek word baptizo, published in the EVANGELIST of Feb. 10th suggested the following notes of inquiry which are respectfully submitted to him for personal perusal and reply.

1. What is the distinctive difference between Classic and "Hellenistic" Greek; when, where, by whom, and for what purpose, was the distinction first made; by Christ or Pedro Baptist theologians?

2. Was not "Classic" Greek the only Greek in current use during the life and times of Christ and the apostles; and was not the ground-idea expressed by the word baptizo, in Classic Greek, invariably to put into or under water, or other penetrable substance, so as to entirely submerge or immerse?

3. Was not the act to immerse or submerge always expressed in the literal application of the word; and was not this the basis of its metaphorical use?

When describing or commanding the initiatory rite of the church did Christ not use the word baptizo as the classics understood it—as the common people understood and used it in their every day avocations—which was submerge, plunge, immerse, overwhelm? If not, did he employ the word in a new sense—a sense wholly unknown to those whom he addressed, with the full intention of mystifying and misleading the mind? Is it not more likely that he used the term in the distinct, corporeal and simple sense of its unvarying usage?

5. It is not disputed that the word may have or had other, secondary or remote significations, but can you produce a single example from the earliest age of Greek literature down to its close in which the word has any other meaning than to immerse or its equivalent in which it was used to signify a partial application of water by sprinkling or affusion, or purifying or cleansing, aside "from the literal act of immersion as the means of cleansing or purifying?" If not then Christ must have used the word in commanding the act of induction into His church in its common unvarying usage to immerse or submerge. Or was he the author of the "Hellenistic" Greek in which the word is mystified until it has half a dozen meanings in general but none in particular?

6. Did it not occur to him (Moyer) while preparing his essay that in all the examples cited the idea of sprinkling or affusion, both in fact and effect, were more foreign to a fair critical, scholastic interpretation than immerse or overwhelm? Will he read Acts 2 with analytical care and tell us if he can by any possible stretch of the principles of correct criticism avow that the "baptism of the Holy Spirit was anything short of a total immersion of the person baptized?"

7. And in his pursuit of knowledge has he not learned the universally admitted, and self-evident fact that neither Greek, Latin, French, English nor German, contains a solitary word that embodies more than one meaning when applied to but one thing. Every time a word "has a different meaning" it must of necessity be applied to a different thing. It is upon this basis, and in harmony with the principle of interpretation that the EVANGELIST maintains, and justly, that baptizo when applied to the act of induction into the church of Christ universally and invariably means immerse. Is he willing to risk the effort to maintain the negative either in

Greek Latin or English i. e. that baptizo when applied to the act of induction into the Christian Church can have more than one simple, distinct, unvarying signification?

8. Accepting his implication that baptizo can and does mean immerse, pour, sprinkle in New Testament Greek and its concomitant accompaniment that immersion is therefore a mode of baptism, pouring is a mode of baptism, sprinkling is a mode of baptism. Will he please inform us what baptism is? If each of these separate acts is merely a mode of what theologians call baptism, then what is baptism—or that of which each of these is only the mode? If each of these is only a mode of baptism, and no scholar can evade such conclusion from his stricture it is important that men be instructed as to the substance, fact, reality, or essence of the thing itself. Those who have studied Classic Greek cannot comprehend or perceive it. Perhaps he can elucidate it in Hellenistic?

9. Does he not know that Dr. Philip Schaff in his latest and best work asserts that immersion was the sole practice of the primitive church save in remote instances and then "other forms" were not considered regular. And this undoubtedly was, and is, the unvarying opinion of all great Christian theologians.

10. Was not sprinkling or affusion considered irregular and short of the full, complete, and unquestionable legal administration of the rite of Christian baptism for the first ten centuries of the Christian period?

11. And was not "Hellenistic Greek—the Greek in which baptizo was given a mystic, misleading undefined and unexplicit cluster of significations the invention of certain theologians whose ambition was to accommodate the meaning of the word to their irregularities of practice?"

Other questions press for expression but these are sufficient for all practical purposes for the present. Your critic is requested to maintain, defend, or repudiate his positions taken, or to harmonize his wild essay with its implications with sound scholarship of christendom, in the matters of fact surrounding the correct uses of the Greek verb considered.

S. H. BASHOR.

Maple Home, Feb. 19, 1886

Explanatory.

Inasmuch as my former article "Baptizo in the Bible" has been misinterpreted, and my motives misconstrued, it is but justice to myself, in accepting bro. H's invitation to state my own position, rather than stand upon the inferences of another.

As to the mode of the ordinance of baptism, I believe in trine immersion, since, by the best historical authorities, that was the general mode of early church. (Schaff, Bryennios, Archimandrite, Philaret, Bapheidos, Germecii, Dr. John Mason Neale, William Wall, Joseph Bingham, Dean Stanley, etc.)

It was not my object to discuss the mode of baptism, but in view of the unmodified assertion that "Baptizo means dipped, overwhelmed or plunged in water or a liquid, and to say that it does not mean immersion is the same as saying the word 'God' means the 'devil,'" it was my honest purpose to briefly present the use of baptizo as found in the Bible itself. Whether in doing this I have been faithful to the truth, shall be left to the judgment of the unbiased reader.

I am fully aware that even some of the passages cited have been to the satisfaction of many, apparently swept away, by the very champions of immersion in order to support their cause. But in my opinion, a good cause is only weakened by forced arguments. There is sufficient evidence to establish the authenticity of trine immersion without resorting to arguments that can be fairly and honestly questioned.

Concerning the editor's unkind reflection upon Mt. Morris College, let it be known that it is still the aim of this institution, as it ever has been, to stand on the firm foundation of truth and to instil the principles of the faith and practice of the Brethren.

I am unwilling, however, to bear alone the assertion that "this talk about Hellenistic and Classic Greek; so far as it concerns the New Testament

is largely learned twaddle," therefore I call up the following worthy witnesses to share with me our brother's reproach.

Ernesti says, "We deny, without hesitation, that the diction of the New Testament is pure Greek. . . . In many passages there would arise an absurd and ridiculous meaning if they should be interpreted according to the pure Greek idiom." (Pp. 56, 57)

Winer says, "The Greek of the New T. is a Jewish Greek, which native Greeks generally did not understand, and therefore is a . . . many Greek words are used by the New Testament writers with direct reference to the Christian system, as technical religious expressions, so that from this arises an element, of diction peculiarly Christian." (New Test. Idioms P. 31. 36.)

Dr. G. Campbell says, "Classical use, both in Greek and Latin, is not only in this study sometimes unavailing, but may even mislead. The sacred use and the classical are often very different." (On the Gosp. Vol. 1. P. 58.)

Davidson informs us that, "It is almost superfluous to remark that the nature of the New Test. diction differs from the classical language of Greece.

. . . . When native Hebrews were commissioned to write about Christianity in the Greek tongue, they had ideas for which that tongue furnished no appropriate terms. . . . Hence it became necessary either to employ words, already existing in new senses or to make entirely new ones. Both expedients were adopted." (Bible Crit. pp. 2, 5, 6.)

Michael affirms, "Every man acquainted with the Greek language must immediately perceive that the style of the N. T. is widely different from that of the Classic authors. The New T. was written in a language at that time customary among the Jews, which may be termed the Hebraic Greek the first traces of which we find in the translation of the Seventy or the Septuagint." (Bp. Marsh's Michael's Introduction Vol. 1, c. 4.)

On this same subject the German Plauk says, "Of the truth of this, a man may convince himself at any moment by an experience which is uncontrovertible." (Quoted by Spencer in his Greek Testament.)

Robinson, "The language of the N. T. is the later Greek language as spoken by foreigners of the Hebrew stock, and applied by them to subjects on which it had never been employed by native Greek writers." (Greek and Eng. of the N. T. Intro.)

Seiss, "That the Greek of the New Test. is not Classic Greek is well known to every scholar."

That the Old Testament or Septuagint Greek and not the Classic is the true basis for the New Testament Greek, will be more clearly seen by the following quotations.

"No native Greek had ever written on Jewish affairs nor on the Jewish theology and ritual. Hence the seventy, in their translation had often to employ Greek words as the signs of things and ideas, which heretofore had been expressed only in Hebrew. In such a case, they could only select those Greek words, which most nearly corresponded to the Hebrew; leaving the different shade or degree of signification to be gathered by the reader from the context." (Preface to the G. & E. Lex. to the N. T. p. 6.)

"The Old Testament, therefore and not the dictionaries of Classic Greek, is the lexicon for the New. . . . When they [the N. T. writers] had the Christian thought to express where did they look for the Greek word with which to express it? Not, surely, to Plato, or Socrates, to Demosthenes or Homer. . . . The 'Bible of the people' had shaped for years their thought and their speech. To the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures therefore, they would naturally turn for the Greek word that was needed. Nor would they fail to find it. For the Septuagint reproduces in all essentials the thought of the Heb. text. (Prof. S. Burnham, D. D. in Old Test. Student for Jan. 1886, p. 221.)

One point more and I have done. Inasmuch as I had been writing on the use of baptizo in the Bible, and not upon the mode of baptism. I had no intention of leaving the impression that my authorities quoted were opposed to immersion. No man of intelligence would deny the validity of this form of baptism.

HARVEY P. MOYER.